

Docket No. 743414-15  
Application No. 10/828,504  
Page 10

#### REMARKS

By way of the present response, claims 1, 19, 36 and 43 have been amended, claims 15 and 32 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 49-61 have been added. Claims 1-14, 16-31 and 33-61 currently are pending, of which claims 1-14, 16-31, 33-35 and 40-48 are withdrawn from consideration in response to Applicants' telephonic provisional election made with traverse on March 2, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendment and the remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of all pending claims, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the provisionally elected claims, and allowance of the present application.

In the Office Action, starting on page 2, the Examiner sets forth a restriction requirement between the following inventions:

Group I: Drawn to a laminated glass and a polyvinylchloride film, with claims 1-35 and 40-48 allegedly being readable thereon, and

Group II: Drawn to a method of preparing a laminated glass, with claims 36-39 allegedly being readable thereon.

Applicants hereby confirm the provisional election made with traverse on March 2, 2005. Applicants also submit that because new claims 49-61 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 36, that at least these claims should be examined along with the provisionally elected claims.

Applicant respectfully traverse the restriction requirement, for the following reasons:

In setting forth the restriction, the Examiner asserts, "In the instant case, the laminated glass can be made by a process where the PVC interlayer is annealed after bonding it to the glass sheets (see dependent claims 2, 20, 37, 45)." It is respectfully submitted, however, that independent claim 36 and dependent claims 38 and 39 do not mention any annealing process, much less any order of steps taken in an annealing process. The reasons set forth in section 2 of the Office Action, therefore, are not relevant to these claims.

Additionally, claims 40 and 43-47 are directed to processes and not products as alleged by the above groupings. Moreover, none of claims 40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 recite PVC annealing processes or any particular order of steps involving PVC annealing processes.

Furthermore, withdrawn claims 40-42 appear to link Group I and Group II inventions as characterized by the Examiner. Thus, the withdrawal of these claims does not appear

W673875.1

Docket No. 743414-15  
Application No. 10/828,504  
Page 11

consistent with what the Examiner believes are divisible inventions. Moreover, MPEP §809 instructs that linking claims must be examined along with the elected invention. For these additional reasons, the restriction requirement is believed improper.

Finally, the restriction fails to provide proper reasons for insisting upon restriction between claims drawn to processes of preparing a polyvinylchloride film and claims drawn to processes for preparing a laminated glass. Nor has the Examiner provided reasons why such inventions would be considered independent and distinct, as required. See, MPEP §803. As such, there does not appear to be any proper basis for the restriction, as well as a showing of undue burden on the Examiner.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction is improper and that all pending claims 1-14, 16-31 and 33-61 should be examined together.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges Applicants' claim for convention priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and notes that the certified copy of Australian application, namely Australian Provisional Application No. 2002-952196, has not been filed. Applicants submit herewith a Submission of Certified Priority Document in Support of Claim for Convention Priority, which includes a certified copy of the prior foreign application. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgment of receipt of the certified copy.

Also on page 3 of the Action, the Examiner objects to the declaration for allegedly failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a). Specifically, the Examiner asserts, "The oath or declaration is defective because: it does not identify the foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate on which priority is claimed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55, and any foreign application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed, by specifying the application number, country, day, month and year of its filing." It is respectfully submitted, however, that Applicants have fully complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.55 because 37 CFR 1.63(c)(2) provides that information pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55 can be supplied on an application data sheet filed in accordance with 37 CFR 1.76. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants attach herewith the Application Data Sheet (downloaded from the USPTO public PAIRS system) submitted on December 22, 2004, which specifies Applicants' claim for benefit of priority with respect to Australian Provisional Application No. 2002-952196, having a filing date of October 22, 2002. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the declaration submitted on

W673875.1

Docket No. 743414-15  
Application No. 10/828,504  
Page 12

December 22, 2004, is not defective, and that the objection to the declaration should be withdrawn.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 36 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by either Baudin (U.S. Patent No. 4,842,664) or Jang et al. (European Patent Application No. EP 1112840). These rejections are respectfully traversed, to the extent that the Office may consider that they apply to the amended claims.

Independent claim 36 is directed to a method of preparing a laminated glass comprising a polyvinylchloride interlayer located between two sheets of glass. The method comprises bonding the interlayer to the glass sheets using an adhesive layer located between the interlayer and each glass sheet. Claim 36, as amended, recites that at least one of the adhesive layers is formed from a material comprising a waterborne or water reducible polyurethane emulsion, a waterborne or water reducible polyester emulsion, or a combination thereof. Support for the amended subject matter is found in Applicants specification, for example, at page 6, lines 23-26. It is respectfully submitted that neither Baudin nor Jang et al. describe at least one of the adhesive layers formed from a material comprising a waterborne or water reducible polyurethane emulsion, a waterborne or water reducible polyester emulsion, or a combination thereof, as set forth with the other features recited in claim 36.

The Action also includes rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 of claims 36, 38 and 39 as being unpatentable over Baudin in view of Jang et al., and of claim 37 as being unpatentable over the Baudin and Jang et al. documents in further view of Isaksen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,984,593). However, as pointed out above, neither of the Baudin or Jang et al. documents describes "at least one adhesive layer is formed from a material comprising a waterborne or water reducible polyurethane emulsion, a waterborne or water reducible polyester emulsion, or a combination thereof," as set forth in claim 36. Furthermore, the Isaksen et al. patent, which relates to uniaxially stretched-orientate PVC products, fails to teach or suggest bonding a PVC interlayer to glass sheets using an adhesive layers, wherein at least one adhesive layer is formed from a material comprising a waterborne or water reducible polyurethane emulsion, a waterborne or water reducible polyester emulsion, or a combination thereof as claimed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that none of the applied documents teach or suggest the invention as presently claimed.


W673875.1

Docket No. 743414-15  
Application No. 10/828,504  
Page 13

New claims 49-61 also are believed allowable at least because each these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 36, and thus encompass the patentable combination of features recited in this claim. Furthermore, these dependent claims set forth combinations including additional features not believed taught or suggested by the cited references.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice of allowance is respectfully requested without further delay. Should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to expedite resolution of any such matter.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Donald R. Studebaker  
Registration No. 32,815

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000

W673875.1